

To: Dunbar, Bill[dunbar.bill@epa.gov]; Potokar, Steven[Potokar.Steven@epa.gov]
From: MacIntyre, Mark
Sent: Wed 4/13/2016 4:40:03 PM
Subject: FW: questions from Capital Press

Received this AM.....FYI Only!!!!

From: Don Jenkins [mailto:djenkins@capitalpress.com]
Sent: Wednesday, April 13, 2016 8:58 AM
To: MacIntyre, Mark <Macintyre.Mark@epa.gov>
Subject: questions from Capital Press

Hi Mark,

Thanks for calling back yesterday.

As I said, I'm writing a story about how What's Upstream came about. My deadline is April 22.

My main sources are the reports the Swinomish tribe filed to the EPA and reports from Strategies 360.

The reports say EPA filled in the white boxes, the tribe filled in the yellow boxes.

The boxes are too small to provide a great amount of detail, but the information that is there is revealing.

The EPA assigned the tribe seven tasks. Some of them quite specific: use Facebook, Twitter, YouTube; place at least five newspaper ads and then make "tactical" decisions about future ad placements; place "earned media" stories.

And the EPA expected "outputs/deliverables."

The tribe's environmental policy director stated in a report dated April 24, 2012, how to measure the grant's effectiveness: "By 2016 Washington will have stronger non-point source pollution (sic) measures in place." (That was a copy and paste job. I'm not trying to be overly dramatic.)

So here are my questions:

Did the EPA agree that the goal of the grant was to have stronger non-point source pollution measures in place by 2016?

Did the tribe follow government procedures in awarding the contract to Strategies 360? (This question is motivated in part by the thought that the tribe hired Strategies 360 because the firm's chief operating officer was the tribe's lawyer. I realize, of course, that everybody at Strategies 360 has connections from previous jobs. The issue is whether rules to award contracts were followed.)

How much has EPA spent to date on What's Upstream? (It's been frustrating to get anything but passive-aggressive answers from the tribe or commission. The numbers are a little murky because there was another aspect to this grant.)

How much has Strategies 360 received?

Why did the EPA approve of hiring a public-relations firm to develop "public education"?

Why didn't the EPA object to the tone and content of the campaign before April 5?

Did EPA modify the campaign materials in any way?

What's the EPA's comment on the whatsupstream.com website?

For example, any thoughts on using a stock photo of cows who knows where standing in a stream?

How about using a photo of a spawned salmon to imply that farmers poison fish?

Also, the links in many cases fail to support the statements on the website. (I could go into detail if you like, but I'll spare you here. If you want a good example, check out the link to the statement that between 2005-13 three-quarters of money spent on cleaning up water went to clean up water contaminated by agriculture.)

Now that the EPA has said its grant should not have been used for the campaign, will it demand the money back?

End of questions.

My impression of the records is that EPA wanted the tribe and environmental groups to promote "regulatory certainty" with public education. That's not too shocking. But the end result was something that the EPA has distanced itself from. How did this happen is the big question.

I hope the EPA will respond to these questions and explain itself.

Thanks,

Don Jenkins

Capital Press

360-722-6975